UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,439	09/08/2003	Larry White	SONY-26600	4739

7590   11/27/2009

Jonathan O. Owens
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
162 North Wolfe Road
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

EXAMINER
PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 August 2009_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-42_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-42_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _4/23/2009, 4/29/2009, 5/19/2009, and 7/10/2009_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Application No. 10/658,439 filed on 22

9/8/2003. The argument presented on 8/26/2009 is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-42

have been examined.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The claim status "currently amended" should be corrected as –previously

amended--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29-34 and 36-40 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (hereinafter Carter)(US Pub. No.

US 2002/0194309 A1) in view of Hays et al. (hereinafter Hays)(US Pub. No.

2002/0046278).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15, Carter discloses as follows:

A media server (master digital multimedia device, reference character 112 in figure 1, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0027], lines 4-10) comprising;

A database to store content data (multimedia database, reference character 106 in figure 1, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0028]);

The content source database is capable of communication with other network devices to deliver the data stored in the database (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0028]); and

A content directory service to browse the content data stored in the database and to provide information regarding the content data stored in the database (the user can selects the desired multimedia works to be synchronized and download for storage on the digital multimedia device from the music multimedia database and the selected digital data is downloaded from the music multimedia database into the data storage memory unit of the digital multimedia device, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0031]).

Carter does not explicitly teach a content directory service to maintain directory information related to new content received and an interface layer coupled to communicate with the synchronization application and the content directory service to discover new content data and provide update information to the content directory service regarding the new content data received by the database from the external device during content data synchronization

Hays teaches as follows:

A content directory service to maintain directory information related to new content received (the distribution server provides its directory to the collection kiosk to retrieve the new information, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]);

A content directory service to browse the content data stored in the database (the description of web pages are stored in a certain directory of the file system and a user of the collection kiosk uses the browser to browse the various web pages (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]);

The server interface (equivalent to applicant's interface layer) is responsible for accessing the central medical information system to retrieve updated content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]); and

The server interface stores the updated content in the web page directory (equivalent to applicant's content directory service) to overwrite or augment existing web page content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Hays with Carter in order to efficiently synchronize multiple devices each other via a central database so that all the devices have the same content and content management.

Regarding claims 3, 10, 16, and 22, Carter discloses that the external device or the network device is a second media server (the digital multimedia player, 104 in figure 1, automatically performs the synchronization and download function between master and subordinate digital multimedia devices which means the digital multimedia player

works exactly same as the master digital multimedia player, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0032], lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 4, 11, 17, and 23, Carter discloses that the external device or the network device includes an Internet service (network system connects all external devices is the Internet representing a worldwide collection of networks and gateways that use the TCP/IP suite of protocols to communicate with one another, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0027], lines 16-19).

Regarding claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, 30, 36, and 37, Carter discloses that the content data includes media files such as audio, video, graphic, and text data (see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0033], lines 14-18).

Regarding claim 21, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 1.

The examiner interpreted the first update information as updating from the external devices to the database and the second update information as updating from other than the external devices to the database then later synchronized to the external devices.

Carter further teaches several synchronization directions, from a database to multimedia devices (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], from the master multimedia devices to subordinate multimedia device (see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0032] and from subordinate multimedia device to master multimedia device (see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0032]).

Carter does not explicitly disclose synchronization process from the external device to the database.

Hays teaches as follows:

the synchronization process from the external device to the database (the central medical information database may contain the medical information collected through the collection kiosks and collected through other sources, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0023] and figure 8);

A content directory service to maintain directory information related to new content received (the distribution server provides its directory to the collection kiosk to retrieve the new information, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]);

A content directory service to browse the content data stored in the database (the description of web pages are stored in a certain directory of the file system and a user of the collection kiosk uses the browser to browse the various web pages (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]);

The server interface (equivalent to applicant's interface layer) is responsible for accessing the central medical information system to retrieve updated content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]); and

The server interface stores the updated content in the web page directory (equivalent to applicant's content directory service) to overwrite or augment existing web page content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]).

Regarding claims 27 and 31, Carter teaches as follows:

A method of synchronizing data between two network devices (see, e.g.,

paragraph [0016], lines 1-3), the method comprising:

Sending first update information to a content directory service (visual display

means) from an interface layer (control unit) regarding a first new content data received

by a first media device (data storage memory unit of the digital multimedia device) from

a second media device (music multimedia database) during content data

synchronization performed by a synchronization application (see, e.g., page 3,

paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0031] and figure 3);

Sending second update information to the synchronization application

(processor, 302 in figure 3) from the interface layer (control unit) regarding a second

new content added to the first media device (data storage memory unit, 312 in figure 3,

of the digital multimedia device), wherein the second new content data is synchronized

with the second media device (music multimedia database) during a next content data

synchronization (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0031] and figure

3), thereby maintaining by the content directory service directory information related to

the first new content received (content management means, see, e.g., page 5,

paragraph [0045], therefore the system allows multiple devices to synchronize its

internal collection with each other); and

Sending the first update information to the content directory service and sending

the second update information to the synchronization application are performed

automatically (see, e.g., page 4. paragraph [0032], lines 1-5).

Hays further teaches regarding the content directory service and the interface layer as follows:

A content directory service to maintain directory information related to new content received (the distribution server provides its directory to the collection kiosk to retrieve the new information, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]);

A content directory service to browse the content data stored in the database (the description of web pages are stored in a certain directory of the file system and a user of the collection kiosk uses the browser to browse the various web pages (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]);

The server interface (equivalent to applicant's interface layer) is responsible for accessing the central medical information system to retrieve updated content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]); and

The server interface stores the updated content in the web page directory (equivalent to applicant's content directory service) to overwrite or augment existing web page content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]).

Therefore, they are rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 1.

Regarding claims 32-34 and 38, Carter discloses as follows:

A method or an apparatus of synchronizing data between two network devices (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0016], lines 1-3), the method comprising:

Performing data synchronization between a first media server and a second media server (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], lines 2-8);

Receiving content data related to the data synchronization on the first media

server (data storage memory unit, 312 in figure 3, of the digital multimedia device, see,

e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], lines 12-18);

Obtaining update information related to the received content data from a

synchronization application on the first media server (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph

[0031], lines 21-24);

Providing the update information to a content directory service (visual display

means) of the first media server (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0030], lines 16-21); and

Updating the content directory service according to the update information (see,

e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], lines 21-24 and paragraph [0030], lines 16-21), thereby

maintaining by the content directory service directory information related to the received

content data (content management means, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0045],

therefore the system allows multiple devices to synchronize its internal collection with

each other).

Carter does not explicitly disclose synchronization process from the external

device to the database.

Hays teaches the synchronization process from the external device to the

database (the central medical information database may contain the medical

information collected through the collection kiosks and collected through other sources,

see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0023] and figure 8).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine Hays with Carter to include synchronization from

multimedia devices to a database in order to efficiently synchronize multiple devices

each other via a central database so that all the devices have the same content and

content management.

Regarding claims 39 and 40, they are rejected for similar reason as presented

above in claims 1 and 8.

Carter further teaches automatically providing update information (the digital

multimedia device (equivalent to applicant's media server) allows the user, via the

control unit (equivalent to applicant's interface layer) to request and download new

recorded data (equivalent to applicant's new content data) into the digital multimedia

device or program the digital multimedia device to synchronize and update the user's

files automatically from a multimedia database (equivalent to applicant's database), see,

e.g., page 4, paragraph [0031]).

5.   Claims 5, 12, 18, 24, 28, 35, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Carter et al. (hereinafter Carter)(U.S. Pub. No. US

2002/0194309 A1) in view of Hays et al. (hereinafter Hays)(US Pub. No.

2002/0046278), and further in view of Gu et al. (hereinafter Gu)(U.S. Patent No.

6,892,230 B1).

Regarding claims 5, 12, 18, 24, 28, and 35, Carter in view of Hays teach all the

claim limitations of claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, and 32 as explained above except for

disclosure of the media server is a Universal Plug and Play enabled device and the

content directory service is a Universal Plug and Play content directory service.

The general concept of enabling a Universal Plug and Play featured device and service is well known within the art as illustrated by Gu which teaches a Universal Plug and Play (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 20-29).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Gu with Carter in view of Hays to include using a Universal Plug and Play enabled device and service as taught by Gu in order to avoid user installation experience, persistent relationship configurations and software driver download whenever connecting multiple network devices together.

Regarding claims 41 and 42, Carter in view of Hays teach all the claim limitations of claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 27, and 32 as explained above except for disclosure of the media server is a Universal Plug and Play enabled device and the content directory service is a Universal Plug and Play content directory service.

Therefore, they are rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 5.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A.   Summary of Applicant's Arguments

In the remarks, the applicant argues as followings:

1) Regarding claim 1, Carter, Hays and their combination do not teach an interface layer coupled to communicate with the synchronization application and the content directory service to discover the new content data and provide update

information to the content directory service regarding the new content data received by

the database from the external device during the content data synchronization.

2) Regarding claim 39, Carter, Hays and their combination do not teach to

automatically provide update information to the content directory service regarding the

new content data received by the database from the external device during the content

data synchronization without user intervention.

B.   Response to Arguments:

In response to argument 1), Hays teaches as follows:

Interface layer (interpreted as server interface) coupled to communicate with the

synchronization application (any software program to update or retrieve new

information) and the content directory service to discover the new content data (the

distribution server provides its directory to the collection kiosk to retrieve the new

information, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]) and provide update information to the

content directory service regarding the new content data received by the database from

the external device during the content data synchronization (the server interface stores

the updated content in the web page directory (equivalent to applicant's content

directory service) to overwrite or augment existing web page content, see, e.g., page 3,

paragraph [0026]).

Therefore, Carter in view of Hays teach the interface layer coupled to

communicate with the synchronization application and the content directory service to

discover the new content data and provide update information to the content directory

service regarding the new content data received by the database from the external

device during the content data synchronization.

In response to argument 2), Carter further teaches automatically providing

update information (the digital multimedia device (equivalent to applicant's media

server) allows the user, via the control unit (equivalent to applicant's interface layer) to

request and download new recorded data (equivalent to applicant's new content data)

into the digital multimedia device or program the digital multimedia device to

synchronize and update the user's files automatically from a multimedia database

(equivalent to applicant's database), see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0031]).

The applicant claimed "automatically providing update information during the

content data synchronization without user intervention." Therefore Carter teaches

automatic synchronization without user intervention **during the synchronization**

period (a program to synchronize and update the user's files automatically from a

database, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0031], lines 5-8). Such the program inherently

does not require user intervention while running the program.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-

1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30

EST.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

November 12, 2009

/NATHAN FLYNN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454